



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Mayūrāṣṭaka, an unedited Sanskrit poem by Mayūra.

—By G. P. QUACKENBOS, A. M., Tutor in Latin,
College of City of New York.

WHAT little knowledge we have of the poet Mayūra rests largely on legend and tradition, but it is now generally accepted that he flourished in the seventh century of our era, was one of the *habitués* at the court of the emperor Harṣavardhana, and was the rival, in the field of literature, of Bāṇa, author of the *Kādambarī* and of the *Harṣacarita*.

In an old legend, preserved principally in Jaina tradition, and existing in several versions,¹ we are told that Mayūra, on one occasion, wrote a licentious description of the charms of his own daughter, Bāṇa's wife. That lady, enraged, cursed her father, who, in consequence of the curse, became a leper, and was banished from court. Nothing daunted, however, he set to work to regain his health and his lost position, and composed the *Sūryaśataka*², consisting of a hundred stanzas in praise of Sūrya, the sun-god. At the recitation of the sixth stanza, the sun appeared in bodily form, and cured the poet of his leprosy. Bāṇa, jealous of Mayūra's triumph, and seeking

¹ The principal versions of this legend are found in two anonymous commentaries on the Jaina poet Mānatuṅga's *Bhaktāmarastotra*, in Madhusūdana's commentary on Mayūra's *Sūryaśataka*, and in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga, who was a Jaina. For the anonymous commentaries on the *Bhaktāmarastotra*, see F. E. Hall, *Subandhu's Vāśavadattā*, Calcutta, 1859, intro. pp. 7, 8, 49, and Rājendralāla Mitra, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of His Highness, the Mahārāja of Bikāner*, Calcutta, 1880, p. 671, no. 1463, and Bühler, *On the Caṇḍikāśataka of Bāṇabhaṭṭa*, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 1 (1872), pp. 111—115; for the commentary of Madhusūdana, see Bühler, *On the Authorship of the Ratnāvalī*, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 2 (1873), pp. 127—128; and for the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, see the translation of that work by C. H. Tawney, Calcutta, 1901, pp. 64—66.

² This is Mayūra's best-known work. The most accessible edition is that in *Kāvya-mālā* Series, no. 19, Bombay (2nd ed.), 1900.

to emulate his example, had his own hands and feet cut off, and then composed the *Caṇḍīśataka*¹, in honor of Caṇḍī, the wife of Śiva. But in the recitation of his poem, he did not have to proceed any further than the sixth syllable of the first stanza before the goddess appeared and restored his limbs to their former condition. Now it happened that a Jaina, Mānatuṅga, was present, and wishing to show that the Jainas were not lacking in miracle-working powers, he ordered himself to be loaded with forty-two chains², and to be locked up in a room. He then began to compose the *Bhaktāmarastotra*³, which consists of forty-four stanzas. At the conclusion of each stanza, one of the forty-two chains dropped off, and when the whole forty-four stanzas had been recited, the locked doors flew open of their own accord, and he was free. The king, Harṣa (or Bhoja, as some accounts call him), had witnessed all three miracles, but deciding that Mānatuṅga's was the greatest, he became a convert to Jainism.

In one version of the legend, that, namely, given by the first anonymous commentator on the *Bhaktāmarastotra*, the name of the obnoxious poem that so displeased Mayūra's daughter, and that brought upon Mayūra the curse of leprosy, is said to be the *Mayūrāṣṭaka*. While recently working up the life and writings of Mayūra for a forthcoming volume of the Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, I noted that a poem of this name was recorded in Professor Garbe's catalogue⁴ of the Sanskrit manuscripts at Tübingen University. Through the kindness of Professor Garbe and of Dr. Geiger, the librarian at Tübingen, the manuscript containing the *Mayūrāṣṭaka* was forwarded to Professor Jackson for my use. The material is birch-bark, folded in book form, each leaf being $7\frac{5}{8}$ by $6\frac{3}{8}$ inches, with 16 lines of writing to a full page. The writing is in the *śāradā* script,

¹ Ed. with commentary, in *Kāvya-mālā* Series, Part 4, Bombay (2nd ed.), 1899.

² Other accounts say 34 or 48 chains; cf. Hall, *op. cit.* pp. 8, 49.

³ Edited (transliteration and translation) by Jacobi, *Indische Studien*, vol. 14, Leipzig, 1876, pp. 359—376, with forty-four stanzas. Ettinghausen, *Harṣa Vardhana, Empereur et Poète*, Louvain, 1906, p. 127, n. 2, mentions several editions, one containing 48 stanzas.

⁴ Richard Garbe, *Verzeichniss der indischen Handschriften der königlichen Universitäts-Bibliothek*, Tübingen, 1899, no. 182, F.

and the date should probably be placed in the seventeenth century.¹

The *Mayūrāṣṭaka*, which covers one full leaf, and parts of two other leaves, consists, as its name implies, of eight stanzas. Of these, the first and the sixth are incomplete, owing to a tear in the manuscript. Stanzas 1, 2, and 4 are in the *sragdharā* meter, the others in *śārdūlavikrīḍita*. The dedication is to Hari and Hara (Viṣṇu and Śiva), and at the end is the colophon *iti śrīmayūrāṣṭakam samāptam*. After the colophon comes a kind of diagram, which may be something astrological, though I have been unable to decipher anything from it except the words *saṃvat 2*.

The theme of the poem is the description of a girl or young woman, and at times, especially through the *double entendres* and puns, the sentiment is decidedly erotic, and might very well have given offence to the person portrayed. In a general way the style is not unlike the style of other compositions ascribed to Mayūra. For example, the puns and *double entendres*, already referred to, besides other Kāvya elements,

¹ The ms. in Garbe's *Verzeichniss* (see note preceding) 182 F was one of those purchased in 1894 by Marc Aurel Stein at Śrīnagar in Kaśmīr (*Verzeichniss*, p. 3), and the date is according to the Saptarṣi era (ibid., p. 5, n. 1; personal letter from Prof. Garbe, April 4th, 1911). "At the end of the *Durgāṣṭaka* [one of the pieces in the collection contained in the manuscript in question] the copyist gives the date (*lāukika*) *saṃvat 87, grāvati 5, gaṇāu*" (Stein in Garbe, *Verzeichniss*, p. 78), and, as Prof. Garbe writes me, "die Ähnlichkeit der äußeren Beschaffenheit aber zeigt, daß die beiden darauf folgenden Stücke [*Vetālastotra*, *Mayūrāṣṭaka*] in annähernd derselben Zeit geschrieben sein müssen".

The Saptarṣi era began B. C. 3076 (Bühler, in Weber, *Indische Studien*, vol. 14, Leipzig, 1876, pp. 407—408). During the centuries which, in consideration of the average age of birch-bark manuscripts (see Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, Straßburg, 1896, p. 88), can alone be here taken into account, the fifth of Śrāvana fell on Saturday in the year 87 of any century of this Saptarṣi era only in 4687 and 4487 — Saturday, Śrāvana 5, 4687 corresponding to Aug. 13, 1611 (Gregorian calendar), and Saturday, Śrāvana 5, 4487 to July 25, 1411, of the Julian calendar (as reckoned according to Robert Schram, *Kalendarographische und chronologische Tafeln*, Leipzig, 1908). Since of these two dates the former is the more likely, we may ascribe the completion of our manuscript to Aug. 13, 1611. (On the Saptarṣi era, see Sewell and Dikshit, *The Indian Calendar*, London, 1896, p. 41; Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, Leipzig, 1906, vol. 1, pp. 382—384; A. Cunningham, *Book of Indian Eras*, Calcutta, 1883, pp. 6—17.)

are common to it and to the *Sūryaśataka*, and that Mayūra did not disdain the erotic sentiment elsewhere is shown by a perusal of the descriptive verse on two asses, which is found under his name in the *Subhāṣitāvali* of Vallabhadeva, and also in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*.¹ It may count for something, too, that the meter of three of the stanzas is the *sragdharā*, the same as that in which the *Sūryaśataka* is composed, as well as most of the anthology stanzas attributed to Mayūra.

In view of all the facts and circumstances as set forth, it seems not unreasonable to believe that the poem *Mayūrāṣṭaka*, contained in the Tübingen manuscript, is a creation of the poet Mayūra, although it must be acknowledged that the evidence is not especially strong. It may be argued, for example, that the name *Mayūrāṣṭaka* may mean "the *aṣṭaka* on the peacock", or that the commentator on the *Bhaktāmaraśtotra* ascribed it to Mayūra merely because of its name, or that it is the composition of another Mayūra, not the seventh-century poet of that name.

But on the other hand stand the facts that the name *śrī-mayūrāṣṭakam* is found in the colophon of the manuscript, that the subject-matter of the manuscript poem harmonizes with the content of the *Mayūrāṣṭaka* described by the commentator, that there is not the faintest allusion to a peacock in any of the stanzas, and that there is a general similarity in point of style between the manuscript poem and the known writings of Mayūra. The *pros* are, on the whole, stronger than the *cons*, and it can at least be said that there is no direct evidence to show that Mayūra did not write the *Mayūrāṣṭaka* contained in the Tübingen manuscript. Until such evidence is adduced, I am inclined to accept it as his work.

It gives me pleasure to express my thanks to Professor Jackson and to Dr. Gray for many valuable suggestions, and also to Professor Barret, who was good enough to verify my transliteration of the *śāradā* script.

¹ Peter Peterson, *The Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhadeva*, Bombay, 1886, no. 2422; Peterson, *The Paddhati of Śārṅgadharā*, Bombay, 1888, no. 585. See also the modern anthology, *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāraṃ*, compiled by K. P. Parab, Bombay (3rd ed.), 1891, p. 327, v. 17.

MAYŪRĀṢṬAKA.

Verse 1.

om namaḥ śrīharīharābhyām

eṣā¹ kā prastutām²gī pracalitanayanā hamsalīlā³vrajantī
dvāu hastāu kuṅkumārdrāu kanakaviracita⁴ . . ū
..⁵um[gām]gegatā sā bahukusumayutā baddhaviṇā hasanti
tāmbūlam⁶ vāmahaste⁷ madanavaśagatā gūhya⁸ śālām praviṣṭa⁹

¹ The meter is *sragdharā*.

² In the matter of transliterating the nasals, I have faithfully followed the manuscript, which is inconsistent, sometimes writing *anusvāra* instead of the appropriate nasal consonant. Compare, for example, *lag-nāmga* (2a), *prīyāmga* (3d), and *gaganāmgaṇā* (8d), with *bhrūbhaṅgam* and *anaṅga* (7b). Note also *aṃtaḥ* for *antaḥ* (3c), *caṃpaka* with lingual nasal, instead of *campaka* (8b), and *saṃpakva* for *sampakva* (5b). In the use of the nasal before *k*, there appear to be no irregularities except *śaṃkayantī* for *śaṅkayantī* (2b); cf. *kuṅkuma* (1b), and *paṅka* (7c).

³ The word *līlā* is one of the stock terms used to define the natural graces of the heroine; cf. *Daśarūpa, a Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy*, tr. Haas, New York, 1911, 2.60, "Sportiveness (*līlā*) is the imitation of a lover in the actions of a fair-limbed maiden."

⁴ One, possibly two consonants must come between the *a* and the *ū*; the syllable containing the *a* must be heavy, and six syllables must be supplied after the *ū*.

⁵ One syllable is missing.

⁶ Betel was as much an adjunct of love-making among the ancient Hindus as candy and confections are to-day. Usually it was brought by the man to the girl, but here the girl appears to be carrying it as a gift to her lover; cf. Schmidt,³ *Beiträge zur indischen Erotik*, Leipzig, 1902, p. 728.

⁷ Was the left hand the erotic one, as implied, for example, in the epithet "left-handed", when used to denote the obscene form in the Tantra cult?

⁸ I take *gūhya* to be a gerund (cf. Whitney, *Skt. Grammar*, 992 c), but the author doubtless intended that it should be read also, though with short *u*, as first member of a compound with *śālām*—*gūhyasālām*, "private chamber"; cf. *gūhyadeśān* (4 d).

⁹ In *śāradā*, the same ligature represents both *ṣṭa* and *ṣṭha*. Prof. Barret, who has transliterated part of the Pāippalāda Manuscript of the Atharvaveda, which is in *śāradā* (cf. JAOS. vol. 26, 2nd part, pp. 197—295), writes me: "about *ṣṭa* and *ṣṭha*; as far as I have seen, there is no difference made, the same sign serving for both."

Translation.

Om. Reverence to the illustrious Hari and Hara.
 Who is this (maiden), with beautiful limbs and wandering
 glance, approaching with the gait of a *haṃsa*?
 Her two hands are moist with saffron, her.....composed of gold,

 She has.....on her [body]; she is decked with many flowers,
 girt with a lute, and is smiling.
 Concealing betel in her left hand, and having yielded to the
 power of love, she enters the [private] chamber.

Verse 2.

eṣā¹ kâ bhuktamuktâ pracalitanayanâ sveda²lagnâṃgavastrâ
 pratyūṣe yāti bālā³ mṛga iva cakitâ sarvataś śaṃkayantī
 kenedaṃ vaktrapadmaṃ sphuradadhararasaṃ śaṭpad⁴enāiva
 pītaṃ
 svargah⁵ kenāḍya bhukto haranayanahato manmathah⁵ kasya
 tuṣṭaḥ

Translation.

Who is this maiden that, not partaking of food and with
 wandering glance, and with garments clinging to her
 limbs with perspiration,

¹ The meter is *sragdharā*.

² For perspiration as a mark of love, see Sappho, frag. 2, v. 4, ἀ δὲ
 μ' ὄρωσ κακχέεται.

³ In erotics, *bālā* means a young girl under sixteen, who wishes to be loved in darkness, and delights in betel (Schmidt, pp. 243—246; especially the citation (p. 244) from *Anaṅgarāṅga*, fol. 5 b). She is also a *mṛgī*, "gazelle" (cf. *mṛga* 2 b, and *harinī* in 3 b and 8 c), so eats little (cf. *bhuktamuktā* in 2 a), and has high-set (*unnata*) breasts, cf. Schmidt, pp. 212—213.

⁴ *Śaṭpada* suggests *bhramara*, which means both "bee" and "lover".

⁵ In the ligature here transliterated by *hk*, I have taken the first element to be the sign for *jihvāmūliya*, the surd guttural spirant, cf. Whitney, *Skt. Grammar*, 69, 170 d, 171 c. Prof. Barret, however, in his transliteration of the Pāippalāda Manuscript of the Atharvaveda, adopted *ṣk* as the transcription of the character; compare, for example, JAOS. vol. 26, 2nd part, New Haven, 1906, p. 218 foot, v. 18, *vaṣ kāmā*, and p. 224 foot, v. 25, *jātaṣ kasyapo*, with the Pāippalāda facsimiles, folios 6 a, line 3, and 7 b, line 12, respectively. But he has since written me: "The signs which I transliterated *ṣka* and *ṣpa* are not exactly representatives of lingual *ṣ*, but that seemed the best rendering."

At dawn goes here and there, timid [and] distrustful, like a gazelle?

How is this? Has this lotus face with its lower lip's welling nectar, been sipped by a bee?

By whom has heaven been enjoyed to-day? With whom has Kāma, [once] slain by Śiva's eye, been pleased?

Verse 3.

eṣā¹ kā stanapinabhārakaṭhinā² madhye daridrāvati³
vibhrantā hariṇī⁴ vilolanayanā samtrasta⁵yūthodgatā
amtaḥsv(e⁶)dagajendraganḍagalitā⁷ samlīlayā⁸ gacchati⁹

¹ The meter is *śārdūlavikrīḍita*.

² Perhaps, "stiff with the burden of her swelling breasts"; i. e. she must walk very upright, or the weight of her breasts would make her stoop-shouldered.

³ There may be an obscene pun in *madhye daridrāvati*; for the passionateness of the *mrgī*, see Schmidt as cited p. 348, note 3. For *dridrāvati*, not found in the lexicons, cf. Whitney, *Skt. Grammar*, 1233 d.

⁴ For *hariṇī*, "gazelle", see *mrgī*, p. 348, note 3.

⁵ The reading of the manuscript is *samtrastha*.

⁶ The manuscript is broken above the *sv* ligature, but the restoration of the *e* is unquestionably correct.

⁷ According to folk-belief, even in modern India (cf. W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*, 2nd ed., Westminster, 1896, vol. 2, p. 240), there is, in the forehead of an elephant, a magic jewel, the *gajamukta*, which grants to him who possesses it his every wish. The author seems here to be comparing his heroine to this magic jewel.

⁸ I have rendered *samlīlayā* as "like"; cf. St. Petersburg Wörterbuch, unabridged ed., s. v. *līlā*, 3. The compound of *līlā* and *sam* is not found in the lexicons, but occurs twice in this poem; cf. 8c.

⁹ The whole of line 3 may be read with a second rendering, containing an obscene pun: "She goes, possessed, through her wanton sport with [her lover], of that which falls from the temple of the rutting lord of elephants," i. e., possessed of the *mada*, which also means *semen virile* and *ἀρροῖατα ῥοῖς*; this latter, in the case of the *mrgī*, has the odor of flowers (Schmidt, p. 213), and would therefore attract bees (or lovers; cf. p. 348, n. 4), just as the *mada* of a must-elephant does. [Prof. Jackson takes this second rendering to be the correct interpretation, as opposed to that presented in the text and in notes 7 and 8.]

dr̥ṣṭvā rūpam idaṃ priyāṃgagahanam¹ vṛddho² (')pi kāmā-
yate³

Translation.

Who is this timid gazelle, with a burden of firm, swelling
breasts,
With roving glance, and slender of waist, gone forth from the
frightened herd?
She goes like as she were fallen from the temple of a rutting
lord of elephants.
Seeing this form, with its adornment of beautiful limbs, even
an old man becomes a Kāma.

Verse 4.

vāmenāveṣṭayanti⁴ praviralakusumam keśabhāram kareṇa
prabhraṣṭam cottariyam ratipatitagunām mekhalām dakṣiṇena
tāmbūlam codvahanti vikasitavadanā⁵ muktakeśā narāgā⁶
niṣkrāntā guhyadeśān madanavaśagatā mārutam prārthayanti

Translation.

With her left hand doing up her heavy hair, on which few
flowers [now remain],
And with her right holding up her upper garment, her girdle,
whose cord had slipped down

¹ The compound *priyāṃgagahanam* may be read in two ways. In the first way, take *gahanam* as from *gahanā*, "adornment", and the second reading, which is obscene, may be found by taking *gahanam* as "place of concealment", and *priyāṃga* as a *tatpuruṣa* compound, *priya* denoting the lover.

² Is *vṛddho* a reference to Bāṇa, the husband of Mayūra's daughter? Bāṇa may have been of the same age as Mayūra, and so considerably older than his wife.

³ The regular causative of the root *kam* is *kāmāyate*. I therefore take *kāmāyate* to be a denominative from *Kāma*; cf. Whitney, *Skt. Grammar*, 1059 c, and Brugmann, *Vgl. Gram. der idg. Sprachen*, Straßburg, 1892, 2. 769 (p. 1107). The meter requires that the second syllable of *kāmāyate* should be long.

⁴ The meter is *sragdharā*.

⁵ "With blooming face", or, punningly, "with open mouth", "yawning".

⁶ The word *narāgā* is not found in the lexicons, but on the analogy of *naroga*, "not ill", I have taken it to mean "not passionate", i. e., "with passion sated".

During love, and her betel; with blooming face, with disheveled hair, with passion sated,
Coming forth from the private chamber, having yielded to the power of love, she longs for the breeze.

Verse 5.

ēṣā¹ kā navayāuvanā śaśimukhī kāntāpathī² gacchati
nidrāvyākulitā vighūrṇanayanā sampakvabimbādhara
keśair vyākulitā nakhair vidalitā³ dantāis ca khaṇḍīkṛtā⁴
kenedaṃ ratirākṣasena ramitā śārdūlavikrīḍitā

Translation.

Who is this lovely one advancing along the path, moon-faced,
in the bloom of youth,
Bewildered with sleep, her eye rolling, her lower lip like a
ripe *bimba* fruit,
Bewildered by her [disordered] locks, scratched by finger-nails,
and torn to pieces by teeth?
How is this? By a demon in love has she, imitating tiger-sport, been beloved!

¹ The meter is *śārdūlavikrīḍita*. Note the pun possibly implied in *śārdūlavikrīḍitā*, line 4.

² I resolve as *kāntā āpathī*. Compare the Vedic *āpathī* (RV. 1. 64. 11), which evidently means, as Geldner (*Der Rig-Veda in Auswahl*, Stuttgart, 1909, vol. 2, p. 11) says, "auf der Straße fahrend" (cf. also Bezzenberger, in *Fépas, Abhandlungen zur idg. Sprachgeschichte Aug. Fick gewidmet*, Göttingen, 1903, pp. 175—176), a connotation which is also supported by Sāyaṇa's commentary *ad loc.* Or, perhaps we should read *kāntā pathī*, with *pathī* as fem. nom. sing. of **patha* (**pathī*), with which compare the epithets of the Maruts—*āpathī*, *vipathī*, *antaspatha*, *anupatha*, RV. 5. 52. 10; yet note *tripathā*.

³ The manuscript reads *vimḍalitā*.

⁴ References to scratching and biting, as concomitants of indulgence in *ratī*, are found throughout Sanskrit erotic literature. For *nakha-cchedya* (scratching with the nails), see Schmidt, pp. 478—496, and for *daśanacchedya* (biting with the teeth), *ibid.* pp. 496—508. Is there not also in *khaṇḍīkṛtā* a possible punning allusion to the *khaṇḍābhraka* ("broken-cloud") bite on the breast, in form of a circle, with uneven indentures from the varying size of the teeth (Schmidt, p. 504)? The reference to his daughter's disheveled appearance, as being due to the scratches and lacerations, may have been responsible for that lady's anger and her consequent curse of Mayūra (see intro.). And in this connection it may be added that the obscene puns in verse 3 would probably not tend to lessen her displeasure.

Verse 6.

eṣā¹ kâ paripūrṇacandravadanā gāurimrgā² kṣobhinī³
 līlāmattagajendrahamsagamanā⁴ e . .
 n(i⁶)ḥśvasādharagandhaśitalamukhī vācā mṛdūllasini
 sa ślāghyaḥ puruṣas sa jīvati⁷ varo yasya priyā hīdrśi

Translation.

Who is this frantic tigress, with a face like the full moon,
 With the gait of the *hamsa*, or of the lordly rutting elephant
 in wantonness ,
 With her face cooled by the perfume of her sighing lower lip,
 and gently mirthful in her speech?
 That man is to be envied, that lucky one lives, who has truly
 such a one as his beloved.

Verse 7.

eṣā⁸ kâ jaghanasthalī sulalitā⁹ prṇmattakāmādhikā

¹ The meter is *śārdūlavikrīḍita*.

² I take *gāurimrgā* to mean "beast of Gāurī" (with a pun on *mrgā* [cf. note on *mrgī*, p. 348, n. 3] as the sort of girl the heroine is), and the beast of Gāurī (in her incarnation as Durgā) is the tiger. As Pārvatī also, Gāurī's vehicle is the tiger; cf. Moor, *Hindu Pantheon*, London, 1810, plates 20, 21, 24. My interpretation as "tigress" seems also to be strengthened by the allusion to "tiger-sport" in the last line of the preceding stanza.

³ The word *kṣobhinī* is not recorded in the lexicons except with lingual nasal as the name *kṣobhinī*, of a certain *śruti* in *Samgītasāra-samgraha*, 23 (cf. St. Petersburg Wörterbuch, abridged ed., s. v. *kṣobhinī*); it is here probably best regarded as the feminine of *kṣobhaṇa* or of **kṣobhin*.

⁴ In Manu, 3. 10 (*hamsavāraṇagāminīm*), the gaits of the *hamsa* and of the elephant are mentioned as among the desirable graces of women.

⁵ Seven syllables are needed to fill out the line.

⁶ The manuscript is broken here, but part of a vertical stroke can be seen, and the restoration of an *i* seems certain.

⁷ The manuscript reads *jīvatiḥ*. For the sentiment expressed in *jīvati* compare the well-known line of Catullus (5.1), *Vivāmus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus*.

⁸ The meter is *śārdūlavikrīḍita*.

⁹ *Lalita* is one of the stock terms used to define the graces of the heroine; cf. *Daśarūpa*, tr. Haas, 2.68, "Lolling (*lalita*) is a graceful pose of one of fair form."

bhrūbhaṅgaṃ kuṭilaṃ tv anaṅgadhanuṣaḥ¹prakhyam prabhā-
candravat²
rākācandrakapolapaṅkajamukhī kṣāmodarī sundarī
vīṇādaṇḍam³ idam vibhāti tulitaṃ⁴ veladbhujaṃ⁵ gacchati

Translation.

Who is this lovely one that goes, with rounded hips, with
an excess of ecstatic love—
Her curving frown like the bow of the Bodiless (Kāma), and
like the moon in splendor—
With lotus face like the cheek of the full moon, and she
[herself] slender-waisted and beautiful?
This neck of her lute seems like a raised quivering arm.

¹ In the ligature here transliterated by *hṛ*, I have taken the first element to be the sign for the *upadhmāṇiya*, or surd labial spirant; cf. Whitney, *Skt. Grammar*, 69, 170d, 171c. In Prof. Barret's transliteration of the Pāippalāda Manuscript, this same ligature is transcribed by *ṣp* (cf. JAOS. vol. 26, 2nd part, New Haven, 1906, p. 213 foot, *devāṣ pitaro*, and *vaṣ pari-*, with the Pāippalāda facsimiles, folio 4b, lines 11 and 12), though Prof. Barret says (see above, p. 348, n. 5) that it does not exactly represent *ṣp*. If the word *dhanuṣaḥprakhyam* be regarded as a compound, we should naturally expect the dental sibilant before initial *p*, as is the case, for example, in such a word as *vācaspati* (cf. Whitney, *Skt. Gram.* loc. cit.), yet, in favor perhaps, of its being so regarded, it may be noted that above (stanza 6d) we have *ślāghyaḥ puruṣas*, which cannot be a compound, with *visarga* before initial *p*. However, it should be remarked that the Pāippalāda Manuscript, before initial *p*, seems to use, indifferently, either *visarga* or the ligature under discussion; cf. the instances given above with folio 6a, line 7, *devaḥ pradiśā*, and folio 7a, line 5, *nirṛtyāḥ pāśebhyo*.

² The accusatives in line 2 are hard to explain, unless they may possibly comprise an extension of the simple adverbial accusative, on which see Carl Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, Breslau, 1880, pp. 171—175, 215—233. Or perhaps *bhrūbhaṅgaṃ* is to be regarded as neuter (cf. note on *bhuja* below), though it is not found as neuter elsewhere. If it is neuter, it probably becomes the subject of an *asti* understood.

³ The form *vīṇādaṇḍa* is not given in the lexicons; the regular spelling is *vīṇādaṇḍa*, though the word is given only by the lexicographers, and is not found in the literature.

⁴ In *tulitaṃ*, the manuscript shows only the upper part of the *i*, the vertical stroke being missing.

⁵ *Bhuja* is not found as neuter elsewhere, but for neuters of this class of compounds (including *vīṇādaṇḍam*), see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, Göttingen, 1905, II. 1. 15b (p. 39); and on the interchange of masculine and neuter (cf. *daṇḍaḥ* and *daṇḍam*), see Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt. der idg. Sprachen*, Straßburg, 1893, 1. 37 (p. 130).

Verse 8.

eṣā¹ kā ratihāvabhāva²vilasaccandrānanam bibhratī
 gātram caṇpakadāmagāurasadr̥ṣaṃ³ pīnastanālambitā
 padbhyām samcaratī pragalbha⁴hariṇī saṃlīlayā svechayā
 kiṃ cāiṣā gaganāṃganā bhuvitale sampādītā brahmaṇā
 iti śrīmayūrāṣṭakam samāptam

Translation.

Who is this with a face like the shining moon through her
 <incitement to> and her <state of> amorousness,
 Drooping from [the weight of] her full-rounded breasts, with
 a body like the yellowness of a garland of cham-
 paka flowers,
 A wanton "gazelle", going on two feet, in dalliance as she
 feels?
 Surely this is a celestial nymph, produced on earth by Brahmā.
 Here ends the illustrious *Mayūrāṣṭaka*.

¹ The meter is *śārdūlavikrīḍita*.

² I have rendered *bhāva* in two ways, "incitement to" and "state of".

³ The manuscript reads *māurasadr̥ṣaṃ*, which is unintelligible. I have emended to *gāurasadr̥ṣaṃ*, at the suggestion of my friend, Dr. C.J. Ogden, who referred me to the compounds *kanakacampakadāmagāurīm* (Bilhana's *Cāurapañcāśikā*, v. 1), and *campakadāmagāurī* (Mahābhārata 15. 25. 13).

⁴ *Pragalbhā* is another of the stock terms (cf. *līlā*, 1a, and *lalita*, 7a) defined in Hindu rhetorical treatises; it is translated "experienced" by Haas, in his translation of the *Daśarūpa*, 2. 29. For *pragalbhā*, as a type of heroine, cf. Schmidt, pp. 264—266.